UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,	Case No. CR 13-330 JJT
Plaintiff,) v.)	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
Fernandi, Gurman Esquiel }	MAY 2 9 2013
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on Young, 2013 to June by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the published (h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases	nchard w. wieking, 2013, the Court exchanges with the court exchanges w
Failure to grant a continuance would be least 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	ikely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
defendants, the nature of the prose or law, that it is unreasonable to expect ac	the to [check applicable reasons] the number of cution, or the existence of novel questions of fact dequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial y this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
Failure to grant a continuance would deny taking into account the exercise of due di	y the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, ligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
Failure to grant a continuance would unre counsel's other scheduled case commitmed See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	easonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given ents, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
	easonably deny the defendant the reasonable time g into account the exercise of due diligence.
IT IS SO ORDERED.	
DATED: 5/21/13	
	JOSEPH C. SPERO United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney
	The state of the s
• •	1 1 +